

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,226	05	/30/2001	Kenneth L. Smith	54538USA7C012	9179
32692	7590	02/12/2003			
3M INNOV	ATIVE P	ROPERTIES CO	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 334	427			L OVEN D	
ST. PAUL, N	MN 55133	-3427		LONEY, DO	UNALD J
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1772	1
				DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003	0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)	
	09/870226 Snith zta	(
Office Action Summary	Examiner Group Art Unit	
	O-Loney 1772	
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence add	ress
eri d for Reply	>	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET FTHIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIREMONTH(S) FROM THE MAILIN	NG DATE
from the mailing date of this communication.  If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defau	R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered ult, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication atute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	timely.
atus		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12	10/2002	
☐ This action is FINAL.		•
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance exce accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19	pt for formal matters, <b>prosecution as to the merits is close</b> 935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.	<b>d</b> in
sp siti n of Claims		
□ Claim(s) 1-2	is/are pending in the applic	ation.
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from cons	ideration.
□ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.	
D/Claim(s) 1 2	is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.	
		election
□ Claim(s)	•	
□ Claim(s)————————————————————————————————————	requirement.	
• •	requirement.	
oplicati n Papers	requirement. ing Review, PTO-948.	
oplicati n Papers  See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw	requirement. ing Review, PTO-948 is □ approved □ disapproved.	
pplicati n Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw  ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objection.	requirement. ing Review, PTO-948 is □ approved □ disapproved.	
oplicati n Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	requirement. ing Review, PTO-948 is □ approved □ disapproved.	
pplicati n Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.	requirement. ing Review, PTO-948 is □ approved □ disapproved.	
Deplication Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	requirement.  ing Review, PTO-948.  is approved disapproved.  ected to by the Examiner.  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  of the priority documents have been	
Deplication Papers  □ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	requirement.  ing Review, PTO-948.  is approved disapproved.  ected to by the Examiner.  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  of the priority documents have been  aber)  international Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).	
Deplication Papers  ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	requirement.  ing Review, PTO-948.  is approved disapproved.  ected to by the Examiner.  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  of the priority documents have been  aber)  international Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).	
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw  ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	requirement.  ing Review, PTO-948.  isapproveddisapproved.  ected to by the Examiner.  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  of the priority documents have been  aber)  nternational Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).	
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw The proposed drawing correction, filed on	requirement.  ing Review, PTO-948.  isapproveddisapproved.  ected to by the Examiner.  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).  of the priority documents have been  aber)  nternational Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).  No(s)	
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Draw  ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	requirement.  ing Review, PTO-948 isapproveddisapproved. ected to by the Examiner.  under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d). of the priority documents have been aber) hternational Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).  No(s)   Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notic of Informal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 09/870,226

Art Unit: 1772

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6280822. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the reasons set forth in the last office action, mailed September 5, 2002.
- 3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,287,670. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 3 in U.S.P No. 6,287,670 contains a making material which would fill the cavities since it is recited to cover the reflective film.
- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- 5. (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jungersen.

Application/Control Number: 09/870,226

Art Unit: 1772

- 7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Donald Loney at telephone number 703-308-2416.

D. Loney/mn February 5, 2003 DONALD J. LONEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER